

Remarks

In response to the final Office Action mailed February 24, 2005, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections and that the case pass to issue in light of the amendments above and the remarks below. Concurrently with the filing of this response, the Applicants have submitted a Request for Continued Examination in order to force entry of the above-identified amendments. These amendments include amending claims 1, 11 and 15. No other claims have been canceled, amended, or added, such that claims 1-18 are pending.

Claims 1, 4 and 11-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by USPN 6,555,928 to Mizuno (hereinafter the Mizuno patent). Claims 2, 3, and 5-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Mizuno patent in view of USPN 6,490,511 to Raftari (hereinafter the Raftari).

Rejection of Claims 1, 4 and 11-18 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to independent claims 1, 11 and 15, which are the only pending independent claims and only independent claims subject to this rejection, obviate the 102(e) rejection in light of the Mizuno patent. In particular, the Mizuno patent fails to disclose a vehicle system controller having integrated control portions which are removable from a vehicle system controller.

The integrated control portions allow the present invention to provide a basic vehicle system controller which may be used with a number of varying types of vehicles. The control portions may be easily changed within the basic vehicle system controller architecture so as to support operation with different types of vehicles. Advantageously, the control portions may be changed through software loading and other interactions with the vehicle system controller so that the control portions can be easily changed without requiring removal of the vehicle system controller from the vehicle.

The Mizuno patent discloses a controller which may be removed from a vehicle. The Mizuno patent fails to disclose that individual control portions of the controller may be removed from the controller. The Applicants are clearly limited to a vehicle system controller which interacts with a number of vehicle subsystem controllers and which itself includes a number of removable control portions that may be easily changed to modify operation of the vehicle subsystem controllers associated therewith. Consequently, independent claims 1, 11 and 15, and dependent claims 4, 12-14 and 16-18, which depend therefrom include all of the limitations thereof, are patentable and nonobvious over the Mizuno patent.

**Rejection of Claims 2, 3 and
5-10 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

The Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2, 3 and 5-10 are patentable at least for the same reasons as independent claims from which they depend are patentable.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that each rejection has been fully replied to and traverse and that the case is in condition to pass to issue. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this case to issue. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned if it would further prosecution of this case to issue.

Respectfully submitted,
Deepa Ramaswamy et al.

By 
John R. Buser
Reg. No. 51,517
Attorney/Agent for Applicant

Date: 24-28-05

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351